



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,058	02/10/2004	Young-Chan Kim	104-R001	1526
38209 7590 11/26/2008 STANZIONE & KIM, LLP 919 18TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 440 WASHINGTON, DC 20006				
EXAMINER				
YANG, RYAN R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2628				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
11/26/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Advisory Action**  
**Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

**Application No.**

10/775,058

**Applicant(s)**

KIM, YOUNG-CHAN

**Examiner**

Ryan R. Yang

**Art Unit**

2628

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 07 November 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: 1-19, 75 and 76.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

20, 22-24, 26-32, 34, 35, 40, 41, 47, 49, 52-61, 63, 64, 66, 67, 69-74 and 77-80

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Ryan R Yang/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2628

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Amended claims 34, 35, 55, 57, 59, 71 and 72, requires further consideration and search..

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant alleges claim 20 is supported by specification. In reply, Examiner considers "mode control signal" (column 6, line 17) is quite different from the "mode signal" as claimed. The mode signal as claimed is a signal to indicate a state of the display. However, the mode control signal in the specification is a signal input by a user to control the display. Also, the pivot enable status (column 7, line 25-29) is not a rotated state of the screen.

As per claims 34 and 40, although applicant has shown the support of the manipulation of an image, he has not shown the support of the generation and manipulation of the first and the second image.

As per claim 35, it is similar to claim 20 that a "mode signal" is different from a "mode control signal". Therefore, "a controller to generate a mode signal indicating a rotated state of the screen body according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate a rotated position of the screen body" is not support by the specification.

As per claim 47 and 49, since the "mode signal" is different from the "mode control signal", the specification does not support "generating a mode signal indicating a rotated state of the screen body in response to a rotation of the screen body."

As per claims 52, 55, 57, 59 and 71, the signals indicated by the applicants are image control signals; they are not signals to indicate a state of a display. Therefore, "a control unit to generate at least one of a mode signal indicating a rotated state of the display unit and a OSD driving signal according to a key manipulation by a user to indicate the rotated state of the display unit and request and OSD, respectively" is not support by the specification.

As per claim 72, although the specification teaches receiving first R-G-B signals and second R-G-B signals, it does not teaches "a display unit to display a picture of externally input color component video signals on the screen body and to display an OSD image simultaneously on the displayed picture."

As per claims 73 and 78, similar to reasons stated in claim 52, "a controller to receive a mode control signal to indicate a rotated state of the display unit and a OSD control signal to request generation of an OSD, and to generate at least one of a pivot signal and a OSD driving signal" is not supported by the specification.

As per claim 47, Kishimoto discloses manipulation of display by using keyboard keys (column 4, line 64- column 5, line 4). At least one of the control signals corresponds to a position of the display. Since the OSD is part of the display, it could also be controlled by the control signal.

As per claim 20, Examiner maintains Kim and Kishimoto combined teach all the limitations.

As per claim 40, Examiner maintains Kim and Kishimoto combined teach all the limitations.

As per claim 52, Examiner maintains Kim and Kishimoto combined teach all the limitations.